

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignina 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,777	01/12/2001	Maria Isabel Gonzalez	5771-P1-01-BD	9663
7	590 06/18/2003			
Warner-Lambert Company			EXAMINER	
2800 Plymouth Ann Arbor, Ml			BAHAR, M	г, молден
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER .
			1617	10
			DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003	1,6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## **Advisory Action**

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/759,777	GONZALEZ ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Mojdeh Bahar	1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover she t with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

Examination (NOE) in compliance with 07 Or N 1.774.
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  NOTE:
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected:
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  10. Other:
Obdinanollan
SREENI PADMANABHAN A PRIMARY EXAMINER

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments against the 35 USC 102 and 112 rejections are moot as they are based on the claims as amended. The amendment is not being entered because it changes the scope of the claims and would require further search and consideration. Applicant's arguments against the obviousness rejections are being considered ONLY in so far as they are based on the non-amended claims. Applicant argues that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established since "an obvious to try" standard has been used and the prior art references do not provide a reasonable expectation of success to the SKilled Artisan, Note that applicant's arguments are primarily based on the teachings of Hurel. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are not persuasive. Hurel clearly teaches that BLPs have acute haemodynamic effects and that BLP antagonists may have a role in the treatment of hypertension. Simply because Hurel indicates that further studies are required, one cannot overlook all the other teachings of the reference. Therefore for the reasons of record and those discussed herein above to adress applicant's new arguments, the obviusness rejections herein are maintained.